



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/932,371	08/17/2001	Thomas Mazzone	11323.0007	4863

7590 02/11/2004

R. Kent Roberts
Hodgson Russ LLP
Suite 2000
One M&T Plaza
Buffalo, NY 14203-2391

EXAMINER

BELL, MELTIN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2121

DATE MAILED: 02/11/2004

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

224

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/932,371		MAZZONE, THOMAS	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Meltin Bell		2121	

-- **Th MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 August 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-52 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-52 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 October 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) ✓ | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>5</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to application **09/932,371** filed 08/17/01.

Claims 1-52 have been examined.

Priority

Applicant's claim for domestic priority against application numbers 60/226,401 filed **8/18/00** and 60/279,870 filed 3/29/01 under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) is acknowledged.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant is respectfully reminded of the ongoing Duty to disclose 37 C.F.R. 1.56 all pertinent information and material pertaining to the patentability of applicant's claimed invention, by submitting in a timely manner PTO-1449, Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) with the filing of applicant's application or thereafter.

Oath/Declaration

A new oath or declaration is required because one of the application numbers for 119(e) priority is incorrect (60/266,401 vs. 60/226,401). The wording of an oath or declaration cannot be amended. If the wording is not correct or if all of the required affirmations have not been made or if it has not been properly subscribed to, a new oath or declaration is required. The new oath or declaration must properly identify the application of which it is to form a part, preferably by application number and filing date

Art Unit: 2121

(e.g. 09/932,371 filed 8/17/01) in the body of the oath or declaration. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

Drawings

The United States Patent and Trademark Office of Draftsperson's Patent Drawings Review have reviewed the formal drawings. They are objected to by the Draftsperson under 37 CFR 1.84 or 1.152 for the reasons indicated on the Form PTO-948, Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review.

The drawings have not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is required in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the drawings.

The drawings are objected to because:

- Page 8, lines 15-21 suggest the boxes of Fig. 2, items 103 and 109 should be conditional diamonds with Yes and No branches.
- Fig. 3, item 215 should be a conditional diamond with Yes and No branches instead of the box.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is required in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

As a method, claim 13 offers abstract ideas (e.g. "information", "descriptions", "database") that are also not applied in the technological arts. Abstract ideas and their manipulation constitute "descriptive material" that is not patentable, *Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759 and *Schrader*, 22 F.3d at 292-93, 30 USPQ2d at 1457-58, respectively. If the abstract ideas of claim 13 represented functional descriptive material consisting of data structures and computer programs which impart functionality when run on a computer (recorded on some computer readable medium), they become structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized. For examples,

Art Unit: 2121

- *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994) offers claim to data structure stored on a computer readable medium that increases computer efficiency held statutory and
- *Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d at 1360-61, 31 USPQ2d at 1759 offers product-by-process claim to computer having a specific data structure stored in memory also held statutory while
- *Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d at 1361, 31 USPQ2d at 1760 offers claim to a data structure *per se* held nonstatutory.

Because the invention is not claimed to be practiced on a computer and/or stored on a computer readable medium, it is not limited to practical applications in the technological arts. Specifically, the claim is a method without any particular practical application, such as a program running on a computer and stored in a computer readable medium or memory. On that basis alone, claim 13 is clearly nonstatutory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

To expedite a complete examination of the instant application, the claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 (nonstatutory) above are further rejected as set forth below in anticipation of applicant amending these claims to place them within the four statutory categories of invention.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 2121

Claims 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 36 recites the limitation "pairs" in line 6 of page 20. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

To expedite a complete examination of the instant application, the claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 (nonstatutory) above are further rejected as set forth below in anticipation of applicant amending these claims to place them within the four statutory categories of invention.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-5, 8, 12-16, 19, 23-31, 34, 38-41, 44 and 48-52 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Feinberg* USPN 6,082,776 (Issued July 4, 2000, Filed May 7, 1997).

Art Unit: 2121

Regarding claim 1:

Feinberg teaches,

- a database of health information descriptions, each description relating to a patient and an associated pair, the associated pair comprising an associated access code and an associated password (Fig. 2, item 100)
- a first computer programmed to provide a prospective pair, the prospective pair comprising a prospective access code and a prospective password (Fig. 2, item 54)
- a second computer, in communication with the data base and with the first computer, the second computer being programmed to determine whether a prospective pair corresponds to one of the associated pairs, and if the prospective pair is determined to correspond to one of the associated pairs, then the second computer provides the description that corresponds to the prospective pair (Fig. 5, item 52; column 7, lines 15-44, "The translator program...the card code")

Regarding claim 2:

Feinberg further teaches,

- the first computer is programmed to provide a change to one of the descriptions (column 6, lines 50-67, "FIG. 2, is a...sends instruc-"; column 7, lines 1-14, "tions to control a...personal medical information")

Regarding claim 3:

The rejection of claim 2 is incorporated. Therefore, claim 3 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 2.

Regarding claim 4:

Feinberg further teaches,

- the second computer is programmed to record who made the change to one of the descriptions (column 5, lines 49-67, "The card 10...reminders encoded and"; column 6, lines 1-8, "visible on the...medical services provider")

Regarding claim 5:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Therefore, claim 5 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

Regarding claim 8:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Therefore, claim 8 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

Regarding claim 12:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Therefore, claim 12 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

Regarding claim 13:

Feinberg further teaches,

- providing a database of health information descriptions, each description relating to a patient and an associated pair, the associated pair comprising an associated access code and an associated password (column 2, lines 50-56, "Special cards, usually...remote computer databases")
- receiving a prospective pair, the prospective pair comprising a prospective access code and a prospective password (Fig. 11B, item 530)

Art Unit: 2121

- determining whether the prospective pair corresponds to one of the associated pairs

(Fig. 11A, item 512)

- if the prospective pair is determined to correspond to one of the associated pairs, then providing the description that corresponds to the prospective pair (column 4, lines 26-

37, "the invention features...to the caller")

Regarding claim 14:

Feinberg further teaches,

- receiving a change to the provided description, and modifying the database according to the change (column 6, lines 50-67, "FIG. 2, is a... sends instruc-"; column 7, lines 1-14, "tions to control a...personal medical information")

Regarding claim 15:

Feinberg further teaches,

- recording who made the change to the provided description (column 5, lines 49-67, "The card 10...reminders encoded and"; column 6, lines 1-8, "visible on the...medical services provider")

Regarding claim 16:

The rejection of claim 13 is incorporated. Therefore, claim 16 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 13.

Regarding claim 19:

The rejection of claim 13 is incorporated. Therefore, claim 19 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 13.

Regarding claim 23:

The rejection of claim 13 is incorporated. Therefore, claim 23 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 13.

Regarding claim 24:

Feinberg further teaches,

- a computer readable program code module to determine whether a prospective pair is among a group of associated pairs (Fig. 2, item 58; Fig. 5, item 52; column 7, lines 15-44, "The translator program...the card code")
- a computer readable program code module to provide medical information corresponding to the prospective pair, if the prospective pair is among the group of associated pairs (Fig. 2, item 11)

Regarding claim 25:

Feinberg further teaches,

- a computer readable program code module to instruct a computer to change the provided medical information (column 6, lines 50-67, "FIG. 2, is a... sends instruc-"; column 7, lines 1-14, "tions to control a...personal medical information")

Regarding claim 26:

Feinberg further teaches,

- a compute readable program code module to instruct a computer to record who made the change to the provided medical information (column 5, lines 49-67, "The card 10...reminders encoded and"; column 6, lines 1-8, "visible on the...medical services provider")

Regarding claim 27:

Feinberg further teaches,

- a computer readable program code module to instruct a computer to provide a message to a user related to an associated pair when the description is provided (column 4, lines 26-37, "the invention features...to the caller")

Regarding claim 28:

Feinberg further teaches,

- a database of health information descriptions, each description relating to a patient and an associated access code (Fig. 2)
- a card having thereon a first computer programmed to require entry of a password prior to providing a prospective access code (Fig. 2, item 10; column 20, lines 63-67, "The ADMIN area...no.; geographic area"; column 21, lines 1-11, "date card 10...protection, as well")
- a second computer, in communication with the data base and with the first computer, the second computer being programmed to determine whether the prospective access code corresponds to one of the associated access codes, and if the prospective access code is determined to correspond to one of the associated access codes, then the second computer provides the description that corresponds to the prospective access code (Fig. 2, item 54)

Regarding claim 29:

Feinberg further teaches,

- the first computer is programmed to provide a change to one of the descriptions (column 6, lines 50-67, "FIG. 2, is a...sends instruc-"; column 7, lines 1-14, "tions to control a...personal medical information")

Regarding claim 30:

Feinberg further teaches,

- the second computer is programmed to receive the change to one of the descriptions, and then modify the database to reflect the change (Fig. 5, item 52; column 7, lines 15-44, "The translator program...the card code")

Regarding claim 31:

Feinberg further teaches,

- the second computer is programmed to record who made the change to the one of the descriptions (column 5, lines 49-67, "The card 10...reminders encoded and"; column 6, lines 1-8, "visible on the...medical services provider")

Regarding claim 34:

Feinberg further teaches,

- one of the associated access codes is issued to one of the patients, and the description corresponding to the one of the patients is related to the one of the associated access codes (column 2, lines 50-56, "Special cards, usually...remote computer databases")

Art Unit: 2121

Regarding claim 38:

Feinberg further teaches,

- the second computer is programmed to cause a message to be sent to a user of the system, the user being related to the provided description (column 4, lines 26-37, "the invention features...to the caller")

Regarding claim 39:

Feinberg further teaches,

- providing a database of health information descriptions, each description relating to a patient and an associated access code (Fig. 2, item 100)
- providing a card capable of providing a prospective access code (Fig. 2, item 10)
- providing a password (column 2, lines 50-56, "Special cards, usually...remote computer databases")
- providing the prospective access code (Fig. 11B, item 530)
- determining whether the prospective access code corresponds to one of the associated access codes (Fig. 11A, item 512)
- if the prospective access code is determined to correspond to one of the associated access codes, then providing the description that corresponds to the prospective access code (column 4, lines 26-37, "the invention features...to the caller")

Art Unit: 2121

Regarding claim 40:

Feinberg further teaches,

- receiving a change to the provided description, and modifying the database according to the change (column 6, lines 50-67, "FIG. 2, is a... sends instruc-"; column 7, lines 1-14, "tions to control a... personal medical information")

Regarding claim 41:

Feinberg further teaches,

- recording who made the change to the provided description (column 5, lines 49-67, "The card 10...reminders encoded and"; column 6, lines 1-8, "visible on the...medical services provider")

Regarding claim 44:

Feinberg further teaches,

- issuing one of the associated access codes to one of the patients, and relating the one of the associated access codes with only the description relating to the one of the patients (column 2, lines 50-56, "Special cards, usually...remote computer databases")

Regarding claim 48:

Feinberg further teaches,

- providing a message to a user related to an associated access code when the description is provided (column 4, lines 26-37, "the invention features...to the caller")

Regarding claim 49:

Feinberg further teaches,

- a computer readable program code module to determine whether a prospective access code is among a group of associated access codes (Fig. 2, item 58)
- a computer readable program code module to provide medical information corresponding to the prospective access code, if the prospective access code is among the group of associated access codes (Fig. 2, item 11)

Regarding claim 50:

Feinberg further teaches,

- a computer readable program code module to instruct a computer to change the provided medical information (column 6, lines 50-67, "FIG. 2, is a...sends instruc-"; column 7, lines 1-14, "tions to control a...personal medical information")

Regarding claim 51:

Feinberg further teaches,

- a computer readable program code module to instruct a computer to record who made the change to the provided medical information (column 5, lines 49-67, "The card 10...reminders encoded and"; column 6, lines 1-8, "visible on the...medical services provider")

Regarding claim 52:

Feinberg further teaches,

- a computer readable program code module to instruct a computer to provide a message to a user related to an associated access code when the description is provided (column 4, lines 26-37, "the invention features...to the caller")

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

To expedite a complete examination of the instant application, the claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 (nonstatutory) above are further rejected as set forth below in anticipation of applicant amending these claims to place them within the four statutory categories of invention.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 6-7, 9-11, 17-18, 20-22, 32-33, 35-37, 42-43 and 45-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Feinberg* USPN 6,082,776 (Issued July 4, 2000, Filed May 7, 1997) in view of *Newton et al* USPN 5,771,291 (June 23, 1998) and further in view of *Corcoran et al* "Smart Cards and Biometrics:" (March 1999).

Regarding claim 6:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated based on *Feinberg's* following teachings:

- a database of health information descriptions, each description relating to a patient and an associated pair, the associated pair comprising an associated access code and an associated password (Fig. 2, item 100)
- a first computer programmed to provide a prospective pair, the prospective pair comprising a prospective access code and a prospective password (Fig. 2, item 54)
- a second computer, in communication with the data base and with the first computer, the second computer being programmed to determine whether a prospective pair corresponds to one of the associated pairs, and if the prospective pair is determined to correspond to one of the associated pairs, then the second computer provides the description that corresponds to the prospective pair (Fig. 5, item 52; column 7, lines 15-44, "The translator program...the card code")

However, *Feinberg* doesn't explicitly teach fingerprint passwords while *Corcoran et al* teaches,

- the prospective password is a fingerprint (page 4, sentences 2-3, "Newer biometric measurements...is the fingerprint")

Motivation – The portions of the claimed system would have been a highly desirable feature in this art for

- Secure authentication (*Corcoran et al*, page 7, Conclusion section, sentences 1-3, "Integrating smart cards...biometric and PIN")

- Fast information transfer (*Feinberg*, column 1, lines 43-63, "A recent paradigm...data storage efficiency")

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine *Feinberg* with *Corcoran et al* to obtain the invention specified in claim 6, a medical information system. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to quickly deliver medical information without compromising privacy.

Regarding claim 7:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated based on *Feinberg*'s following teachings:

- a database of health information descriptions, each description relating to a patient and an associated pair, the associated pair comprising an associated access code and an associated password (Fig. 2, item 100)
- a first computer programmed to provide a prospective pair, the prospective pair comprising a prospective access code and a prospective password (Fig. 2, item 54)
- a second computer, in communication with the data base and with the first computer, the second computer being programmed to determine whether a prospective pair corresponds to one of the associated pairs, and if the prospective pair is determined to correspond to one of the associated pairs, then the second computer provides the description that corresponds to the prospective pair (Fig. 5, item 52; column 7, lines 15-44, "The translator program...the card code")

However, *Feinberg* doesn't explicitly teach retinal scan passwords while *Corcoran et al* teaches,

Art Unit: 2121

- the prospective password is a retinal scan (page 4, sentences 2-3, "Newer biometric measurements... is the fingerprint")

Motivation – The portions of the claimed system would have been a highly desirable feature in this art for

- Secure authentication (*Corcoran et al*, page 7, Conclusion section, sentences 1-3, "Integrating smart cards... biometric and PIN")
- Fast information transfer (*Feinberg*, column 1, lines 43-63, "A recent paradigm... data storage efficiency")

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine *Feinberg* with *Corcoran et al* to obtain the invention specified in claim 8, a medical information system. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to quickly deliver medical information without compromising privacy.

Regarding claim 9:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated based on *Feinberg's* following teachings:

- a database of health information descriptions, each description relating to a patient and an associated pair, the associated pair comprising an associated access code and an associated password (Fig. 2, item 100)
- a first computer programmed to provide a prospective pair, the prospective pair comprising a prospective access code and a prospective password (Fig. 2, item 54)
- a second computer, in communication with the data base and with the first computer, the second computer being programmed to determine whether a prospective pair

Art Unit: 2121

corresponds to one of the associated pairs, and if the prospective pair is determined to correspond to one of the associated pairs, then the second computer provides the description that corresponds to the prospective pair (Fig. 5, item 52; column 7, lines 15-44, "The translator program...the card code")

However, *Feinberg* doesn't explicitly teach issuing a plurality of descriptions based on one associated pair or one associated code while *Newton et al* teaches,

- one of the associated pairs is issued to a physician, and the one of the associated pairs is related to a plurality of descriptions (column 2, lines 46-56, "The initial step...encryption key codes")

Motivation – The portions of the claimed system would have been a highly desirable feature in this art for

- Improved security (*Newton et al*, column 2, lines 35-46, "the new and...be readily employed")
- Fast information transfer (*Feinberg*, column 1, lines 43-63, "A recent paradigm...data storage efficiency")

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine *Feinberg* with *Newton et al* to obtain the invention specified in claim 9, a medical information system. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to quickly deliver medical information without compromising privacy.

Regarding claim 10:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated based on *Feinberg*'s following teachings:

- a database of health information descriptions, each description relating to a patient and an associated pair, the associated pair comprising an associated access code and an associated password (Fig. 2, item 100)
- a first computer programmed to provide a prospective pair, the prospective pair comprising a prospective access code and a prospective password (Fig. 2, item 54)
- a second computer, in communication with the data base and with the first computer, the second computer being programmed to determine whether a prospective pair corresponds to one of the associated pairs, and if the prospective pair is determined to correspond to one of the associated pairs, then the second computer provides the description that corresponds to the prospective pair (Fig. 5, item 52; column 7, lines 15-44, "The translator program...the card code")

However, *Feinberg* doesn't explicitly teach issuing a plurality of descriptions based on one associated pair or one associated code while *Newton et al* teaches,

- one of the associated pairs is issued to a health care provider, and the one of the associated pairs is related to a plurality of descriptions (column 2, lines 46-56, "The initial step...encryption key codes")

Motivation – The portions of the claimed system would have been a highly desirable feature in this art for

- Improved security (*Newton et al*, column 2, lines 35-46, "the new and...be readily employed")

- Fast information transfer (*Feinberg*, column 1, lines 43-63, "A recent paradigm... data storage efficiency")

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine *Feinberg* with *Newton et al* to obtain the invention specified in claim 10, a medical information system. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to quickly deliver medical information without compromising privacy.

Regarding claim 11:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated based on *Feinberg's* following teachings:

- a database of health information descriptions, each description relating to a patient and an associated pair, the associated pair comprising an associated access code and an associated password (Fig. 2, item 100)
- a first computer programmed to provide a prospective pair, the prospective pair comprising a prospective access code and a prospective password (Fig. 2, item 54)
- a second computer, in communication with the data base and with the first computer, the second computer being programmed to determine whether a prospective pair corresponds to one of the associated pairs, and if the prospective pair is determined to correspond to one of the associated pairs, then the second computer provides the description that corresponds to the prospective pair (Fig. 5, item 52; column 7, lines 15-44, "The translator program...the card code")

However, *Feinberg* doesn't explicitly teach issuing a plurality of descriptions based on one associated pair or one associated code while *Newton et al* teaches,

Art Unit: 2121

- one of the associated pairs is issued to a medical cost payer, and the one of the associated pairs is related to a plurality of descriptions (column 2, lines 46-56, "The initial step... encryption key codes")

Motivation – The portions of the claimed system would have been a highly desirable feature in this art for

- Improved security (*Newton et al*, column 2, lines 35-46, "the new and... be readily employed")
- Fast information transfer (*Feinberg*, column 1, lines 43-63, "A recent paradigm... data storage efficiency")

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine *Feinberg* with *Newton et al* to obtain the invention specified in claim 11, a medical information system. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to quickly deliver medical information without compromising privacy.

Regarding claim 17:

The rejection of claim 13 is incorporated based on *Feinberg's* following teachings:

- providing a database of health information descriptions, each description relating to a patient and an associated pair, the associated pair comprising an associated access code and an associated password (column 2, lines 50-56, "Special cards, usually...remote computer databases")
- receiving a prospective pair, the prospective pair comprising a prospective access code and a prospective password (Fig. 11B, item 530)

- determining whether the prospective pair corresponds to one of the associated pairs (Fig. 11A, item 512)

- if the prospective pair is determined to correspond to one of the associated pairs, then providing the description that corresponds to the prospective pair (column 4, lines 26-37, "the invention features...to the caller")

However, *Feinberg* doesn't explicitly teach fingerprint passwords while *Corcoran et al* teaches,

- reading a fingerprint having thereon a pattern corresponding to the prospective password (page 4, sentences 2-3, "Newer biometric measurements...is the fingerprint")

Motivation – The portions of the claimed method would have been a highly desirable feature in this art for

- Secure authentication (*Corcoran et al*, page 7, Conclusion section, sentences 1-3, "Integrating smart cards...biometric and PIN")
- Fast information transfer (*Feinberg*, column 1, lines 43-63, "A recent paradigm...data storage efficiency")

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine *Feinberg* with *Corcoran et al* to obtain the invention specified in claim 17, a method of providing medical information. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to quickly deliver medical information without compromising privacy.

Regarding claim 18:

The rejection of claim 13 is incorporated based on *Feinberg's* following teachings:

- providing a database of health information descriptions, each description relating to a patient and an associated pair, the associated pair comprising an associated access code and an associated password (column 2, lines 50-56, "Special cards, usually...remote computer databases")
- receiving a prospective pair, the prospective pair comprising a prospective access code and a prospective password (Fig. 11B, item 530)
- determining whether the prospective pair corresponds to one of the associated pairs (Fig. 11A, item 512)
- if the prospective pair is determined to correspond to one of the associated pairs, then providing the description that corresponds to the prospective pair (column 4, lines 26-37, "the invention features...to the caller")

However, *Feinberg* doesn't explicitly teach retina passwords while *Corcoran et al* teaches,

- reading a retina having thereon a pattern corresponding to the prospective password (page 4, sentences 2-3, "Newer biometric measurements...is the fingerprint")

Motivation – The portions of the claimed method would have been a highly desirable feature in this art for

- Secure authentication (*Corcoran et al*, page 7, Conclusion section, sentences 1-3, "Integrating smart cards...biometric and PIN")

- Fast information transfer (*Feinberg*, column 1, lines 43-63, "A recent paradigm... data storage efficiency")

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine *Feinberg* with *Corcoran et al* to obtain the invention specified in claim 18, a method of providing medical information. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to quickly deliver medical information without compromising privacy.

Regarding claim 20:

The rejection of claim 13 is incorporated based on *Feinberg*'s following teachings:

- providing a database of health information descriptions, each description relating to a patient and an associated pair, the associated pair comprising an associated access code and an associated password (column 2, lines 50-56, "Special cards, usually...remote computer databases")
- receiving a prospective pair, the prospective pair comprising a prospective access code and a prospective password (Fig. 11B, item 530)
- determining whether the prospective pair corresponds to one of the associated pairs (Fig. 11A, item 512)
- if the prospective pair is determined to correspond to one of the associated pairs, then providing the description that corresponds to the prospective pair (column 4, lines 26-37, "the invention features...to the caller")

However, *Feinberg* doesn't explicitly teach issuing a plurality of descriptions based on one associated pair or one associated code while *Newton et al* teaches,

Art Unit: 2121

- issuing one of the associated pairs to a physician, and relating the one of the associated pairs to a plurality of the descriptions (column 2, lines 46-56, "The initial step...encryption key codes")

Motivation – The portions of the claimed method would have been a highly desirable feature in this art for

- Improved security (*Newton et al*, column 2, lines 35-46, "the new and...be readily employed")
- Fast information transfer (*Feinberg*, column 1, lines 43-63, "A recent paradigm...data storage efficiency")

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine *Feinberg* with *Newton et al* to obtain the invention specified in claim 20, a method of providing medical information. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to quickly deliver medical information without compromising privacy.

Regarding claim 21:

The rejection of claim 13 is incorporated based on *Feinberg's* following teachings:

- providing a database of health information descriptions, each description relating to a patient and an associated pair, the associated pair comprising an associated access code and an associated password (column 2, lines 50-56, "Special cards, usually...remote computer databases")
- receiving a prospective pair, the prospective pair comprising a prospective access code and a prospective password (Fig. 11B, item 530)

Art Unit: 2121

- determining whether the prospective pair corresponds to one of the associated pairs

(Fig. 11A, item 512)

- if the prospective pair is determined to correspond to one of the associated pairs, then providing the description that corresponds to the prospective pair (column 4, lines 26-37, "the invention features...to the caller")

However, *Feinberg* doesn't explicitly teach issuing a plurality of descriptions based on one associated pair or one associated code while *Newton et al* teaches,

- issuing one of the associated pairs to a health care provider, and relating the one of the associated pairs to a plurality of the descriptions (column 2, lines 46-56, "The initial step...encryption key codes")

Motivation – The portions of the claimed method would have been a highly desirable feature in this art for

- Improved security (*Newton et al*, column 2, lines 35-46, "the new and...be readily employed")
- Fast information transfer (*Feinberg*, column 1, lines 43-63, "A recent paradigm...data storage efficiency")

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine *Feinberg* with *Newton et al* to obtain the invention specified in claim 21, a method of providing medical information. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to quickly deliver medical information without compromising privacy.

Regarding claim 22:

The rejection of claim 13 is incorporated based on *Feinberg*'s following teachings:

- providing a database of health information descriptions, each description relating to a patient and an associated pair, the associated pair comprising an associated access code and an associated password (column 2, lines 50-56, "Special cards, usually...remote computer databases")
- receiving a prospective pair, the prospective pair comprising a prospective access code and a prospective password (Fig. 11B, item 530)
- determining whether the prospective pair corresponds to one of the associated pairs (Fig. 11A, item 512)
- if the prospective pair is determined to correspond to one of the associated pairs, then providing the description that corresponds to the prospective pair (column 4, lines 26-37, "the invention features...to the caller")

However, *Feinberg* doesn't explicitly teach issuing a plurality of descriptions based on one associated pair or one associated code while *Newton et al* teaches,

- issuing one of the associated pairs to a medical cost payer, and relating the one of the associated pairs to a plurality of the descriptions (column 2, lines 46-56, "The initial step...encryption key codes")

Motivation – The portions of the claimed method would have been a highly desirable feature in this art for

- Improved security (*Newton et al*, column 2, lines 35-46, "the new and...be readily employed")

- Fast information transfer (*Feinberg*, column 1, lines 43-63, “A recent paradigm... data storage efficiency”)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine *Feinberg* with *Newton et al* to obtain the invention specified in claim 22, a method of providing medical information. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to quickly deliver medical information without compromising privacy.

Regarding claim 32:

The rejection of claim 28 is incorporated based on *Feinberg*’s following teachings:

- a database of health information descriptions, each description relating to a patient and an associated access code (Fig. 2)
- a card having thereon a first computer programmed to require entry of a password prior to providing a prospective access code (Fig. 2, item 10; column 20, lines 63-67, “The ADMIN area...no.; geographic area”; column 21, lines 1-11, “date card 10...protection, as well”)
- a second computer, in communication with the data base and with the first computer, the second computer being programmed to determine whether the prospective access code corresponds to one of the associated access codes, and if the prospective access code is determined to correspond to one of the associated access codes, then the second computer provides the description that corresponds to the prospective access code (Fig. 2, item 54)

Art Unit: 2121

However, *Feinberg* doesn't explicitly teach fingerprint passwords while *Corcoran et al* teaches,

- the prospective password is a fingerprint (page 4, sentences 2-3, "Newer biometric measurements...is the fingerprint")

Motivation – The portions of the claimed system would have been a highly desirable feature in this art for

- Secure authentication (*Corcoran et al*, page 7, Conclusion section, sentences 1-3, "Integrating smart cards... biometric and PIN")
- Fast information transfer (*Feinberg*, column 1, lines 43-63, "A recent paradigm... data storage efficiency")

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine *Feinberg* with *Corcoran et al* to obtain the invention specified in claim 32, a medical information system. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to quickly deliver medical information without compromising privacy.

Regarding claim 33:

The rejection of claim 28 is incorporated based on *Feinberg's* following teachings:

- a database of health information descriptions, each description relating to a patient and an associated access code (Fig. 2)
- a card having thereon a first computer programmed to require entry of a password prior to providing a prospective access code (Fig. 2, item 10; column 20, lines 63-67,

Art Unit: 2121

"The ADMIN area...no.; geographic area"; column 21, lines 1-11, "date card 10...protection, as well")

- a second computer, in communication with the data base and with the first computer, the second computer being programmed to determine whether the prospective access code corresponds to one of the associated access codes, and if the prospective access code is determined to correspond to one of the associated access codes, then the second computer provides the description that corresponds to the prospective access code (Fig. 2, item 54)

However, *Feinberg* doesn't explicitly teach retina passwords while *Corcoran et al* teaches,

- the prospective password is a retina (page 4, sentences 2-3, "Newer biometric measurements...is the fingerprint")

Motivation – The portions of the claimed system would have been a highly desirable feature in this art for

- Secure authentication (*Corcoran et al*, page 7, Conclusion section, sentences 1-3, "Integrating smart cards...biometric and PIN")
- Fast information transfer (*Feinberg*, column 1, lines 43-63, "A recent paradigm...data storage efficiency")

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine *Feinberg* with *Corcoran et al* to obtain the invention specified in claim 33, a medical information system. The modification would have been

Art Unit: 2121

obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to quickly deliver medical information without compromising privacy.

Regarding claim 35:

The rejection of claim 28 is incorporated based on *Feinberg's* following teachings:

- a database of health information descriptions, each description relating to a patient and an associated access code (Fig. 2)
- a card having thereon a first computer programmed to require entry of a password prior to providing a prospective access code (Fig. 2, item 10; column 20, lines 63-67, "The ADMIN area...no.; geographic area"; column 21, lines 1-11, "date card 10...protection, as well")
- a second computer, in communication with the data base and with the first computer, the second computer being programmed to determine whether the prospective access code corresponds to one of the associated access codes, and if the prospective access code is determined to correspond to one of the associated access codes, then the second computer provides the description that corresponds to the prospective access code (Fig. 2, item 54)

However, *Feinberg* doesn't explicitly teach issuing a plurality of descriptions based on one associated pair or one associated code while *Newton et al* teaches,

- one of the associated codes is issued to a physician, and the one of the associated codes is related to a plurality of the descriptions (column 2, lines 46-56, "The initial step...encryption key codes")

Art Unit: 2121

Motivation – The portions of the claimed system would have been a highly desirable feature in this art for

- Improved security (*Newton et al*, column 2, lines 35-46, “the new and...be readily employed”)
- Fast information transfer (*Feinberg*, column 1, lines 43-63, “A recent paradigm...data storage efficiency”)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine *Feinberg* with *Newton et al* to obtain the invention specified in claim 35, a medical information system. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to quickly deliver medical information without compromising privacy.

Regarding claim 36:

The rejection of claim 28 is incorporated based on *Feinberg's* following teachings:

- a database of health information descriptions, each description relating to a patient and an associated access code (Fig. 2)
- a card having thereon a first computer programmed to require entry of a password prior to providing a prospective access code (Fig. 2, item 10; column 20, lines 63-67, “The ADMIN area...no.; geographic area”; column 21, lines 1-11, “date card 10...protection, as well”)
- a second computer, in communication with the data base and with the first computer, the second computer being programmed to determine whether the prospective access code corresponds to one of the associated access codes, and if the prospective access

Art Unit: 2121

code is determined to correspond to one of the associated access codes, then the second computer provides the description that corresponds to the prospective access code (Fig. 2, item 54)

However, *Feinberg* doesn't explicitly teach issuing a plurality of descriptions based on one associated pair or one associated code while *Newton et al* teaches,

- one of the associated pairs is issued to a health care provider, and the one of the associated access codes is related to a plurality of the descriptions (column 2, lines 46-56, "The initial step...encryption key codes")

Motivation – The portions of the claimed system would have been a highly desirable feature in this art for

- Improved security (*Newton et al*, column 2, lines 35-46, "the new and...be readily employed")
- Fast information transfer (*Feinberg*, column 1, lines 43-63, "A recent paradigm...data storage efficiency")

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine *Feinberg* with *Newton et al* to obtain the invention specified in claim 36, a medical information system. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to quickly deliver medical information without compromising privacy.

Regarding claim 37:

The rejection of claim 28 is incorporated based on *Feinberg's* following teachings:

- a database of health information descriptions, each description relating to a patient and an associated access code (Fig. 2)
- a card having thereon a first computer programmed to require entry of a password prior to providing a prospective access code (Fig. 2, item 10; column 20, lines 63-67, "The ADMIN area...no.; geographic area"; column 21, lines 1-11, "date card 10...protection, as well")
- a second computer, in communication with the data base and with the first computer, the second computer being programmed to determine whether the prospective access code corresponds to one of the associated access codes, and if the prospective access code is determined to correspond to one of the associated access codes, then the second computer provides the description that corresponds to the prospective access code (Fig. 2, item 54)

However, *Feinberg* doesn't explicitly teach issuing a plurality of descriptions based on one associated pair or one associated code while *Newton et al* teaches,

- one of the associated codes is issued to a medical cost payer, and the one of the associated codes is related to a plurality of the descriptions (column 2, lines 46-56, "The initial step...encryption key codes")

Motivation – The portions of the claimed system would have been a highly desirable feature in this art for

- Improved security (*Newton et al*, column 2, lines 35-46, “the new and...be readily employed”)
- Fast information transfer (*Feinberg*, column 1, lines 43-63, “A recent paradigm...data storage efficiency”)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine *Feinberg* with *Newton et al* to obtain the invention specified in claim 37, a medical information system. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to quickly deliver medical information without compromising privacy.

Regarding claim 42:

The rejection of claim 39 is incorporated based on *Feinberg*'s following teachings:

- providing a database of health information descriptions, each description relating to a patient and an associated access code (Fig. 2, item 100)
- providing a card capable of providing a prospective access code (Fig. 2, item 10)
- providing a password (column 2, lines 50-56, “Special cards, usually...remote computer databases”)
- providing the prospective access code (Fig. 11B, item 530)
- determining whether the prospective access code corresponds to one of the associated access codes (Fig. 11A, item 512)
- if the prospective access code is determined to correspond to one of the associated access codes, then providing the description that corresponds to the prospective access code (column 4, lines 26-37, “the invention features...to the caller”)

Art Unit: 2121

However, *Feinberg* doesn't explicitly teach fingerprint passwords while *Corcoran et al* teaches,

- providing a password includes providing a fingerprint having thereon a pattern corresponding to the password (page 4, sentences 2-3, "Newer biometric measurements...is the fingerprint")

Motivation – The portions of the claimed method would have been a highly desirable feature in this art for

- Secure authentication (*Corcoran et al*, page 7, Conclusion section, sentences 1-3, "Integrating smart cards...biometric and PIN")
- Fast information transfer (*Feinberg*, column 1, lines 43-63, "A recent paradigm...data storage efficiency")

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine *Feinberg* with *Corcoran et al* to obtain the invention specified in claim 42, a method of providing medical information. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to quickly deliver medical information without compromising privacy.

Regarding claim 43:

The rejection of claim 39 is incorporated based on *Feinberg's* following teachings:

- providing a database of health information descriptions, each description relating to a patient and an associated access code (Fig. 2, item 100)
- providing a card capable of providing a prospective access code (Fig. 2, item 10)

Art Unit: 2121

- providing a password (column 2, lines 50-56, "Special cards, usually...remote computer databases")
- providing the prospective access code (Fig. 11B, item 530)
- determining whether the prospective access code corresponds to one of the associated access codes (Fig. 11A, item 512)
- if the prospective access code is determined to correspond to one of the associated access codes, then providing the description that corresponds to the prospective access code (column 4, lines 26-37, "the invention features...to the caller")

However, *Feinberg* doesn't explicitly teach retina passwords while *Corcoran et al* teaches,

- providing a password includes providing a retina having thereon a pattern corresponding to the password (page 4, sentences 2-3, "Newer biometric measurements...is the fingerprint")

Motivation – The portions of the claimed method would have been a highly desirable feature in this art for

- Secure authentication (*Corcoran et al*, page 7, Conclusion section, sentences 1-3, "Integrating smart cards...biometric and PIN")
- Fast information transfer (*Feinberg*, column 1, lines 43-63, "A recent paradigm...data storage efficiency")

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine *Feinberg* with *Corcoran et al* to obtain the invention specified in claim 43, a method of providing medical information. The modification

Art Unit: 2121

would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to quickly deliver medical information without compromising privacy.

Regarding claim 45:

The rejection of claim 39 is incorporated based on *Feinberg*'s following teachings:

- providing a database of health information descriptions, each description relating to a patient and an associated access code (Fig. 2, item 100)
- providing a card capable of providing a prospective access code (Fig. 2, item 10)
- providing a password (column 2, lines 50-56, "Special cards, usually...remote computer databases")
- providing the prospective access code (Fig. 11B, item 530)
- determining whether the prospective access code corresponds to one of the associated access codes (Fig. 11A, item 512)
- if the prospective access code is determined to correspond to one of the associated access codes, then providing the description that corresponds to the prospective access code (column 4, lines 26-37, "the invention features...to the caller")

However, *Feinberg* doesn't explicitly teach issuing a plurality of descriptions based on one associated pair or one associated code while *Newton et al* teaches,

- issuing one of the associated access codes to a physician, and relating the one of the associated codes to a plurality of the descriptions (column 2, lines 46-56, "The initial step... encryption key codes")

Motivation – The portions of the claimed method would have been a highly desirable feature in this art for

Art Unit: 2121

- Improved security (*Newton et al*, column 2, lines 35-46, "the new and...be readily employed")
- Fast information transfer (*Feinberg*, column 1, lines 43-63, "A recent paradigm...data storage efficiency")

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine *Feinberg* with *Newton et al* to obtain the invention specified in claim 45, a method of providing medical information. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to quickly deliver medical information without compromising privacy.

Regarding claim 46:

The rejection of claim 39 is incorporated based on *Feinberg's* following teachings:

- providing a database of health information descriptions, each description relating to a patient and an associated access code (Fig. 2, item 100)
- providing a card capable of providing a prospective access code (Fig. 2, item 10)
- providing a password (column 2, lines 50-56, "Special cards, usually...remote computer databases")
- providing the prospective access code (Fig. 11B, item 530)
- determining whether the prospective access code corresponds to one of the associated access codes (Fig. 11A, item 512)
- if the prospective access code is determined to correspond to one of the associated access codes, then providing the description that corresponds to the prospective access code (column 4, lines 26-37, "the invention features...to the caller")

Art Unit: 2121

However, *Feinberg* doesn't explicitly teach issuing a plurality of descriptions based on one associated pair or one associated code while *Newton et al* teaches,

- issuing one of the associated access codes to a health care provider, and relating the one of the associated codes to a plurality of the descriptions (column 2, lines 46-56, "The initial step... encryption key codes")

Motivation – The portions of the claimed method would have been a highly desirable feature in this art for

- Improved security (*Newton et al*, column 2, lines 35-46, "the new and... be readily employed")
- Fast information transfer (*Feinberg*, column 1, lines 43-63, "A recent paradigm... data storage efficiency")

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine *Feinberg* with *Newton et al* to obtain the invention specified in claim 46, a method of providing medical information. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to quickly deliver medical information without compromising privacy.

Regarding claim 47:

The rejection of claim 39 is incorporated based on *Feinberg's* following teachings:

- providing a database of health information descriptions, each description relating to a patient and an associated access code (Fig. 2, item 100)
- providing a card capable of providing a prospective access code (Fig. 2, item 10)

Art Unit: 2121

- providing a password (column 2, lines 50-56, "Special cards, usually...remote computer databases")
- providing the prospective access code (Fig. 11B, item 530)
- determining whether the prospective access code corresponds to one of the associated access codes (Fig. 11A, item 512)
- if the prospective access code is determined to correspond to one of the associated access codes, then providing the description that corresponds to the prospective access code (column 4, lines 26-37, "the invention features...to the caller")

However, *Feinberg* doesn't explicitly teach issuing a plurality of descriptions based on one associated pair or one associated code while *Newton et al* teaches,

- issuing one of the associated access codes to a medical cost payer, and relating the one of the associated codes to a plurality of the descriptions (column 2, lines 46-56, "The initial step...encryption key codes")

Motivation – The portions of the claimed method would have been a highly desirable feature in this art for

- Improved security (*Newton et al*, column 2, lines 35-46, "the new and...be readily employed")
- Fast information transfer (*Feinberg*, column 1, lines 43-63, "A recent paradigm...data storage efficiency")

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine *Feinberg* with *Newton et al* to obtain the invention specified in claim 47, a method of providing medical information. The modification

Art Unit: 2121

would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to quickly deliver medical information without compromising privacy.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

- *Feinberg*; USPN 6,082,776
- *Newton et al*; USPN 5,771,291
- *Corcoran et al*; Smart Cards and Biometrics; Linux Journal; March 1999
- *Barrett et al*; Automated Lesion Data Base Building for the Treatment of Retinal Disorders; IEEE International Conference Proceedings Image Processing; Vol.1; 13-16 November 1994; pp 426-430

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Office should be directed to Melvin Bell whose telephone number is 703-305-0362.

This Examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri 7:30 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach this Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, his supervisor, Anil Khatri, can be reached on 703-305-0282. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Application/Control Number: 09/932,371
Art Unit: 2121

Page 45

MB / *M.H.*



ANIL KHATRI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER